

REMARKS

This Response is filed in reply to the Office Action dated July 30, 2007. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1-28 are rejected. No claims are amended, no claims are cancelled and no new claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1-28 remain pending in the application, of which claims 1, 15 and 18 are independent.

Silence with regard to any of the Examiner's rejections is not acquiescence to such rejections, but rather a recognition by Applicants that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on Applicants' remarks and/or amendments. Specifically, silence with regard to Examiner's rejection of a dependent claim, when such claim depends from an independent claim that Applicants consider allowable for reasons provided herein, is not an acquiescence to such rejection of the dependent claim, but rather a recognition by Applicants that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on Applicants' remarks and/or amendments relative to the independent claim (that Applicants consider allowable) from which the dependent claim depends. Furthermore, any cancellations of and amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the instant application. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or a subsequent application.

Claim Rejections Under §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 and 28 under U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Teubner, U.S. Patent 6,981,257 ("Teubner"). Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks herein. Teubner does not render any pending claims herein unpatentable.

Independent claim 15

Independent claim 15 sets forth "[a] computer-readable medium containing instructions for controlling a computer to perform screen-based navigation for interfacing a client with a mainframe system," where the "instructions control[] a computer to" act, including "defin[ing] at least one service in a string based command language," where the

“service include[es] at least one mainframe screen interaction.” The acts also include “receiv[ing] ...XML requests from [the]client,” “pars[ing] said requests into string based command language requests,” “determin[ing] said at least one service corresponding to said string based command language requests to obtain service script corresponding to said at least one service,” and “execut[ing] said service script on said mainframe system to perform said at least one mainframe screen interaction corresponding with said service.”

The Examiner cited Teubner, col. 1, lines 46-51 for “defin[ing] at least one service in a string based command language, said at least one service including at least one mainframe screen interaction.” Respectfully, that passage states that “[e]nterprises have typically extended [e-Business] transactions to the web using ‘web-to-host products that rely on terminal emulation, screen scraping, proprietary development tools and scripting languages.’” Although it refers to “scripting languages,” this passage does not disclose “defin[ing] at least one service in a string based command language, said at least one service including at least one mainframe screen interaction.”

The Examiner cited Teubner, col. 2, lines 42-45 for “receiv[ing] ...XML requests from [the]client.” (Emphasis added.) However, while the passage cited refers to a “client application” that can “*receive an XML document*,” it does not disclose Applicant’s claimed “receiv[ing] ... XML requests *from* [the] client.” (Emphasis added.) Hence, for this reason alone, Teubner does not disclose the limitations of claim 15.

The Examiner cited Teubner, col. 3, lines 53-57 for “pars[ing] said requests into string based command language requests.” Respectfully, that passage states that “products receive a 3270 datastream, parse it, and then convert the datastream to HTML for presentation in web browsers.” This “parsing” however, is not disclosed to be of “*XML requests from [the] client*” that were “receiv[ed] from [a] client,” as set forth in claim 15. Hence, for this reason alone, Teubner does not disclose the limitations of claim 15.

The Examiner cited Teubner, col. 13, line 66 to column 14, line 3 for “determin[ing] said at least one service corresponding to said string based command language requests to obtain service script corresponding to said at least one service.” Respectfully, that passage discloses receiving a request, and passing it to a servlet, which then invokes a CICS Transaction Gateway to forward the request across a network. This passage does not disclose Applicant’s claimed “determin[ing] said at least one service corresponding to said string based command language requests to obtain service script corresponding to said at least one service.”

Finally, he Examiner cited Teubner, col. 19, lines 43-48 for “execut[ing] said service script on said mainframe system to perform said at least one mainframe screen interaction corresponding with said service.” Respectfully, said passage discloses a user manually entering a transaction name on a screen, and, “once entered, ... press[ing] the ENTER key on the keyboard.”

Hence, for all of the above reasons, Teubner does not disclose the limitations of claim 15. It follows that Teubner does not anticipate claim 15.

Independent claim 1

Claim 1 is another independent claim herein. The Examiner did not separately discuss claim 1, but rather rejected it together with claim 15 based on the same analysis and citations from Teubner.

Independent claim 1 sets forth “a method of interfacing between a client and a mainframe system.” The method begins with “receiving requests for services from said client.” After the method “pars[es] said requests,” the method “obtain[s] service definitions based on said parsed requests.” Finally, the method “execut[es] commands based on said service definitions,” where the “commands correspond[] with applications recognized by said mainframe system for providing results to said requests for services.”

Thus, in the method of claim 1, “commands” are “execut[ed] ... based on” “service definitions.”

Teubner does not disclose the limitations of claim 1, in several respects.

The Examiner did not expressly discuss any of the limitations of claim 1. Thus, the Examiner did not cite any passage in Teubner for “obtaining service definitions based on said parsed requests.”

Rather, as discussed above the Examiner cited Teubner, col. 3, lines 53-57 for “pars[ing] said requests into string based command language requests.” Respectfully, that passage states that “products receive a 3270 datastream, parse it, and then convert the datastream to HTML for presentation in web browsers.” This “parsing” however, is not disclosed to be of “*requests for services*” that were “receiv[ed] from [a] client,” as set forth in claim 1. Hence, for this reason alone, Teubner does not disclose the limitations of claim 1.

In addition, that passage discloses “*convert[ing]* the datastream” after it is “parsed.” Thus, it does not disclose “*obtaining service definitions* based on ...parsed requests.”

As also discussed above, the Examiner further cited Teubner, col. 1, lines 46-51 for “defin[ing] at least one service in a string based command language, said at least one service including at least one mainframe screen interaction.” Respectfully, that passage states that “[e]nterprises have typically extended [e-Business] transactions to the web using ‘web-to-host products that rely on terminal emulation, screen scraping, proprietary development tools and scripting languages.’” This passage does not disclose “obtaining service definitions” based on “parsed requests.”

The Examiner did not expressly cite any passage in Teubner for “executing commands based on said service definitions,” where “said commands correspond[] with applications recognized by said mainframe system....”

Rather, as also discussed above, the Examiner cited Teubner, col. 19, lines 43-48 for “execut[ing] said service script on said mainframe system to perform said at least one mainframe screen interaction corresponding with said service.” Respectfully, said

passage discloses a user manually entering a transaction name on a screen, and, “once entered, ... press[ing] the ENTER key on the keyboard.”

Hence, for all of the above reasons, Teubner does not disclose the limitations of claim 1. It follows that Teubner does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claim 18

Claim 18 is the other independent claim herein. The Examiner did not separately discuss claim 18, but rather rejected it together with claims 1 and 15 based on the same analysis and citations from Teubner.

While claim 1 recites “obtaining service definitions based on said parsed requests,” claim 18 recites “a service processor to obtain service definitions based on said parsed requests.” We have set forth above why Teubner does not disclose this limitation of claim 1. By the same reasoning, it does not disclose the above limitation of claim 18.

While claim 1 recites “executing commands based on said service definitions,” claim 18 recites “a host connector interacting with said mainframe system and executing commands based on said service definitions.” We have set forth above why Teubner does not disclose this limitation of claim 1. By the same reasoning, it does not disclose the above limitation of claim 18.

It follows that Teubner does not anticipate claim 18 for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-14, 16-17, 19-26 and 28 also were rejected as unpatentable over Teubner. Insofar as these claims depend from independent claims 1, 15 and 18, and insofar as those claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above, it follows that these claims are allowable as well.

Claim Rejections Under §103

The Examiner rejected claim 27 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teubner in view of Steele et al., U.S. Patent 7,016,877 (referred to hereinafter as Steele).

Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103(a), and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks herein. Insofar as Applicants have demonstrated above that Teubner does not disclose the limitations of claim 18, and insofar as claim 27 depends from claim 18, it follows that claim 18 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims and thus this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance is requested. If there are any remaining issues or the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call David J. O'Neill at the Patent Management Group number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2007

/Stephen B. Deutsch/

Stephen B. Deutsch, Reg. No. 46,663
Attorney for Applicants

CUSTOMER NO. 32127

Verizon
Patent Management Group
1515 N. Courthouse Road
Arlington, VA 22201-2909
Tel: (703) 351-1292